

REMARKS

Claim 28 has been cancelled. Claim 25 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 1-27 are pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner has rejected Claims 10-28 under 35 U.S.C. §101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 10-15 recite a method. As the examiner has acknowledged in her recitation of 35 U.S.C. §101, a “process” is statutory subject matter. Similarly, Claims 16-21 recite an “apparatus,” which is also statutory subject matter. Regarding Claims 22-28, as previously amended, Claim 22 recites a “computer program product embodied in a **tangible** computer-readable medium,” thus the Examiner’s suggestion that Claim 22 recites “intangible media” is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. §101 accordingly.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang (U.S. Patent No. 7,062,553), in further view of Colson (U.S. 2003/0128229). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

As previously explained, the devices of Liang are not billing servers. The Examiner has suggested that “the management server shown in Figure 1, which could consider billing server” but has provided no explanation of why the “management” server of Liang could be considered a billing server. Further, to the extent that Colson teaches a billing server, neither Colson nor Liang, whether in singly or in combination, describe the calculation “of security protection consumption during a period of time by quantifying damages avoided by one or more blocked attacks” as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

As with Claim 1, independent claims 10, 16, and 22 recite "quantifying damages avoided" and "calculating security protection consumption" and are believed to be allowable accordingly.


Claims 11-15, 17-21, and 23-27 depend from Claims 10, 16, and 22, respectively, and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6/23/08


Rebyn Wagner
Registration No. 50,575
V 408-973-2596
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014